



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## ON CERTAIN SUPPOSED LITERARY RELATIONSHIPS. II<sup>1</sup>

BY CAMPBELL BONNER

### III. ALCIPHRON AND LONGUS

The evidence adduced in proof of the alleged imitation of Longus by Alciphron is concerned entirely with specific resemblances. Here as in dealing with the relations between Lucian and Alciphron and between Alciphron and Aelian, Reich<sup>2</sup> begins his argument with an examination of the proper names employed by the authors (pp. 46, 51). Several names, in identical or modified forms, are found in both Alciphron and Longus. In four cases the forms are the same—"Ιππασος, Γνάθων, Μεγακλῆς, Φιλοποίμην— and none of them is very rare. Three of Longus' names—Νάπη (i. 6), Δρύας (i. 4), Ἀγέλη (iv. 39)—occur in Alciphron with amplified forms, Ναπαῖος (ii. 17), Εὐνάπη (ii. 18), Δρυάδης (ii. 39), Δρυαντίδας (ii. 8), Ἀγελαρχίδης (ii. 5). These names are for the most part very rare. According to Pape's *Eigennamen*, Ἀγέλη occurs only in Longus and one inscription,<sup>3</sup> Ἀγελαρχίδης only in Alciphron; the name Ἀγελος is found in Paus. vii. 4. 8. Δρύας occurs some fifteen times, Δρυάδης and Δρυαντίδας only in Alciphron. Νάπη occurs as the name of a woman three times, also as the name of a dog; Ναπαῖος once in Alciphron, once in Nonnus (a satyr's name), and once in an inscription, where the reading is very doubtful; Εὐνάπη only in Alciphron.<sup>4</sup>

Reich contends that Alciphron's use of the longer forms proves that he imitated Longus, since the general tendency of imitators is to expand the names that they have borrowed (p. 51, cf. p. 11). But it is doubtful whether this generalization rests upon anything more than a series of coincidences. At any rate it is subject to

<sup>1</sup>The first part of this paper appeared in *Classical Philology* IV, pp. 32-44.

<sup>2</sup>*De Alciphronis Longique aetate*, Königsberg, 1894; see *Classical Philology* IV, p. 32.

<sup>3</sup>I am unable, however, to verify Pape's reference to the inscription.

<sup>4</sup>But compare Eunapius, the name of the fifth-century sophist.

exceptions. Alciphron makes use of the comic name *Γνάθων* (ii. 32, iii. 8), while Lucian has the longer form *Γναθωνίδης*. This Gnathonides is a character in the *Timon* (45 f.), a parasite, and in Alc. ii. 32 the writer of the letter, a parasite named Gnatho, tells the story of Timon's fallen fortunes and misanthropic seclusion. That we have to do with a reminiscence is clear (cf. Knorr, *Die Parasitennamen bei Alciphron*, p. 17, Belgard, 1875); but according to Reich's rule we should infer that Lucian in composing the *Timon* had borrowed the name *Γνάθων* from Alciphron and lengthened it—which is very far from the truth and from Reich's own opinion (pp. 12 ff.). It is natural enough that an imitator should lengthen a borrowed name in order to conceal the source whence he derives it; but this instance shows that a name might be shortened with the same object in view. For the rest, the similarity in the forms of these rare names is satisfactorily explained by the necessity, which both Alciphron and Longus felt, of giving appropriate names to their rural characters.<sup>1</sup> It contributes nothing of value to the proof that the one writer imitated the other.

The case against Alciphron really rests upon a few passages in the *Letters* which have rather striking parallels in Longus. These had been noted by Erwin Rohde, but he thought that Longus copied Alciphron, and held that opinion even after the appearance of Reich's dissertation (cf. *Griech. Roman*<sup>2</sup>, p. 534 and n. 2, p. 535, n. 3a). Let us examine the passages and determine, if possible, their bearing upon the question.

1. Longus iv. 15: ὁ δὲ . . . . στὰς ὑπὸ τῇ φηγῷ, καὶ ἐκ τῆς πῆρας τὴν σύριγγα προκομίσας, πρῶτα μὲν ὀλίγον ἐπένευσε· καὶ αἱ αἶγες ἔστησαν, τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀράμεναι. εἶτα ἐπένευσε τὸ νόμιον· καὶ αἱ αἶγες ἐνέμοντο, νεύσασθαι κάτω· αὐθις λιγυρὸν ἐνέδωκε· καὶ ἄθροαι κατεκλίθησαν. Cf. i. 27: ἦν δὲ ἄρα καὶ ψῆδική (ἢ παρθένος), καὶ ἐτέρποντο αἱ βόες αὐτῆς τῇ μουσικῇ . . . . ἀλλὰ καθίσασα ὑπὸ πίνυν καὶ στεφανωσαμένη πίνυϊ ᾗδε Πάνα καὶ Πίνυν. καὶ αἱ βόες τῇ φωνῇ παρέμενον.

Alciphron ii. 9: μεσημβρίας οὔσης σταθερᾶς φιλῆνέμον' τινα ἐπιλεξάμενος πίνυν . . . . ὑπὸ ταύτῃ τὸ καῦμα ἐσκέπαζον. . . . καὶ λαβὼν τὴν σύριγγα

<sup>1</sup>With regard to Longus' *Νάπη*, a Lesbian, like all the rest of his characters, it may be noted that there was a Lesbian town of that name, Steph. Byz. s. v. But Ovid's use of Nape as a girl's name (*Am.* i. 11. 2, 12. 4) indicates that as a fancy-name at least the form was not entirely strange.

ἐπέτρεχον τῇ γλώττῃ, . . . καὶ μου ἡδύ τι καὶ νόμιον ἐξηκούετο μέλος. ἐν τούτῳ δέ, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως, ὑπὸ τῆς ἡδυφωνίας θελγόμεναι πᾶσαι μοι πανταχόθεν αἰ αἴγες περιεχύθησαν, καὶ ἀφείσαι νέμεσθαι τοὺς κομάρους καὶ τὸν ἀνθέρικον ὄλαι τοῦ μέλους ἐγίνοντο. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσαις τὸν Ἥδωνὸν ἐμμούμην τὸν παῖδα τῆς Καλλιόπης.

The common features of these passages are not merely identical or similar words, but similar ideas and motives; and our question is, whether these similar ideas belong so exclusively to Longus and Alciphron as to justify the inference that either writer imitated the other. The coincidence regarding the pine tree (πίτυς) has little or no significance. The pine is a conventional background, a scenic property of bucolic poetry. We find it so in Theocritus (i. 1, 134, iii. 38, v. 49) and in Moschus, fragm. I (Wilam.). 7, 8:

γὰ δέ μοι ἀσπαστὰ χά δάσκιος εὔαδεν ὕλα  
ἐνθα καὶ ἦν πνεύσῃ πολὺς ὄνεμος ἅ πίτυς ᾄδει.

So also Leonidas of Tarentum in *Anth. Pal.* vi. 334, *Plan.* 230;<sup>1</sup> Moiro *Anth.* vi. 189. Besides, the pine is a tree sacred to Pan (cf. Long. i. 27; ii. 23, 26), the patron of herdsmen. Hence it comes about that Longus' romance is full of allusions to the pine. With something of the same feeling, Alciphron forms from the word πίτυς an appropriate name for one of his rustics, Πιτυίσκος (ii. 20).

We also hear elsewhere of the νόμιον μέλος, the herdsman's melody, *ranz des vaches*. There is a notice of it in Ath. xiv. 619D, and in a passage of Apollonius Rhodius (i. 569 ff.), which, since it will be necessary to return to it shortly, I quote:

τοῖσι δὲ φορμίζων εὐθήμερι μέλπεν ἀοιδῇ  
Οἰάγροιο πᾶϊς . . . . .  
. . . . . τοὶ δὲ βαθείης  
ἰχθύες αἰσسونτες ὑπερθ' ἄλδος, ἄμμιγα παύροις  
ἀπλετοί, ὕγρὰ κέλευθα διασκαίροντες ἔποντο.  
ὥς δ' ὁπότε' ἀγραυλοιο κατ' ἔχνια σημαντήρος  
μυρία μῆλ' ἐφέπονται ἄδην κεκορημένα ποίης  
εἰς αὖλιν, ὃ δέ τ' εἰσι πάρος σύριγγι λιγείῃ  
καλὰ μελιζόμενος νόμιον μέλος· ὥς ἄρα τοί γε  
ὁμάρτευν· τὴν δ' αἰὲν ἐπασσύτερος φέρεν οὖρος.

<sup>1</sup>Two other allusions to the pine, somewhat different in character, are to be found in Leonidas' epigrams, *Anth.* vi. 110, 262. Is the common liking of Theocritus and Leonidas for the pine anything more than a coincidence? Leonidas' phrase *ποιμενία πίτυς* (*Plan.* 230) has a conventional ring.

Mention should also be made of an epigram of Erycius, in which he alludes to the herdsman's custom of piping the νόμιον μέλος to his cattle, as he rests in the shade; *Anth.* vii. 174.

Now for the idea of cattle being charmed by the music of the herdsman, as we find it elaborated in Longus and Alciphron, no exact parallel can be cited from the sources where we should expect to find it, namely, Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus. However, the flocks and herds are sometimes represented as manifesting an almost human sympathy with the good or evil fortunes of their master; Reich refers to Theocritus i. 74 f., where the cattle lament the death of Daphnis. We may add Mosch. *Epit. Bion.* 23 f. αἱ βόες αἱ ποτὶ ταύροις | πλᾶσδόμεναι γοοῦντι καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλονται νέμεσθαι; cf. ἀφείσαι νέμεσθαι in Alciphron *loc. cit.* But a passage much more similar in feeling to the above quotations from Longus and Alciphron is Theocr. vi. 44 f.:

αὔλει Δαμοίτας, σίρισδε δὲ Δάφνις ὁ βοῦτας·  
ὥρχευντ' ἐν μαλακῇ ται πόρτιες αὐτίκα ποίᾳ.

Reich's argument upon the relation of Longus and Alciphron, as illustrated by the above passages, is about as follows (pp. 53, 55, 65 f.): Longus studied Theocritus closely and imitated him freely—a point which Reich demonstrates in an interesting and thoroughly convincing manner (pp. 56–65). Alciphron, on the other hand, shows only an occasional and superficial reminiscence of Theocritus (p. 55). Therefore we are to conclude that Longus developed this idea of the charming of the flocks by music after thoroughly steeping himself in pastoral poetry,<sup>1</sup> and harps upon it as a pet creation of his own; while Alciphron simply plagiarized the idea from Longus.

In answering this argument, it should be remarked, in the first place, that Reich probably underrates Alciphron's knowledge of Theocritus. He notes that Alciphron quotes the bucolic poet once (Theocr. vii. 82 in Alc. iii. 29. 3), and adapts a few Theocri-

<sup>1</sup> Reich calls attention (p. 66) to the fact that Virgil (*Buc.* viii. 1–4) and Calpurnius (*Id.* ii. 9–11) developed the same notion from the same source, Theocritus. The facts, however, do not help his theory that Alciphron must have drawn upon Longus and no other for this motive; for Virgil, in the passage cited, was almost certainly influenced by other sources, as well as by Theocritus: v. *infra*.

tean phrases of proverbial character. Thus we have a reference to the insignificance of the Megarians (Theocr. xiv. 48 f.)<sup>1</sup> in Alc. iii. 8. 1, and to the danger of rearing wolves (Theocr. v. 38) in Alc. ii. 21. 1. In Theocr. x. 11, we find the saying *χαλεπὸν χορίῳ κύνα γεύσαι*, in Alc. iii. 11. 4, *οὐδὲ γὰρ κύων σκυτοτραγεῖν μαθοῦσα τῆς τέχνης ἐπιλήσεται*; but compare also Luc. *Indoct.* 25, *οὐδὲ γὰρ κύων ἅπαξ παύσαιτ' ἂν σκυτοτραγεῖν μαθοῦσα*. Another supposed parallel noted by Reich depends manifestly upon the adoption of a false text in Alciphron.

With characteristic cocksureness Reich says (p. 54) that there are no other passages from which one may reasonably infer that Alciphron imitated Theocritus. But a careful reading of Alc. iv. 13 reveals a number of Theocritean reminiscences, especially echoes of the *Thalysia*, which, as has been shown, Alciphron quotes elsewhere. This letter tells the story of a picnic of a party of hetairai and their lovers; and although the narrative is marred by coarse passages, some of the descriptions are not unworthy to be called Theocritean in flavor. As minor points of contact with Theocritus may be mentioned several poetical, or chiefly poetical, words, all of which belong to the Theocritean vocabulary—*πῖδαξ*, *ἄνθεμον*, *πέταλον*, *σπιλάς*, *κωτίλος*, *καταλείβω*—and several trees and flowers that find a place in Theocritean landscapes—cypress, laurel, myrtle, plane, ivy, anemone, hyacinth, and melilotus (note especially §§1, 3, 4, 8). Of more importance is the description of an overhanging cliff covered with ivy (§4), which recalls the ivy-hung grotto in Theocr. iii. 13 f. Again, certain touches in Alciphron's description of the *al fresco* banquet recall the well-known scene in the latter part of the *Thalysia*. Alciphron's revelers improvise couches of branches of smilax and myrtle covered with their mantles (§8); in Theocritus (vii. 132 ff.) the guests recline upon pallets of fragrant rushes and vine leaves. Compare also the following passages:

Alc. iv. 13. 9: *ἐαρινοῖς ἐφιζάνουσαι πετάλοις ἥδ' καὶ κωτίλον ἀηδόνες ἐψιθύριζον, ἡρέμα δὲ οἱ σταλαγμοὶ καταλειβόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς οἶον ἰδρούσης σπιλάδος τρυφερόν τινα παρέχον ψόφον ἐαρινῷ πρέποντα συμποσίῳ*.

<sup>1</sup> But see also Plut. *Quaest. conv.* v. 7. 6 (682F), and Fritzsche-Hiller on Theocr. xiv. 49.

Theocr. vii. 136 ff.: τὸ δ' ἐγγύθεν ἱερὸν ὕδωρ  
 Νυμφῶν ἐξ ἄντροιο κατειβόμενον κελάρυζε.  
 τοὶ δὲ ποτὶ σκιαραῖς ὁροδαμνίσιν αἰθαλίωνες  
 τέττιγες λαλαγεῦντες ἔχον πόνον· ἅ δ' ὀλουνγῶν  
 τηλόθεν ἐν πυκινᾷσι βάτων τρύζεσκεν ἀκάνθαις.  
 αἶδον κόρυδοι καὶ ἀκανθίδες, ἔστνε τρυγῶν . . .

It is to be observed that the dripping cliff in Alciphron's description shelters a shrine of the Nymphs and Pan (§4), like the grotto of Theocritus, where the sacred water splashes; cf. also Theocr. v. 33 f., 47 f., [ix. 9]. Other possibly Theocritean features are the special mention of the fine wine (Alc. *loc. cit.* §9, Theocr. vii. 147; xiv. 15 f.) and certain items of the feast—*κόγχοι, κήρυκες, κοχλῖαι, μύκητες* (Alc. §16), cf. *βολβός, κοχλῖας* (Theocr. xiv. 17).<sup>1</sup>

It is not within the province of this paper to prosecute the search for Theocritean ideas and expressions through the whole of Alciphron's work, and indeed it is not likely that many others could be found;<sup>2</sup> for the subject-matter of Alc. iv. 13 lends itself more readily than that of other letters to a treatment in the style of bucolic poetry. But to return from this digression to the comparison of Alciphron and Longus, we find in Alc. ii. 9 (cited above), which has been supposed to be based upon an idea of Longus', two slight marks of the bucolic style. One is the phrase *ἡδύ τι*, for which compare Theocr. i. 1; v. 89; viii. 82; xi. 3; xxiii. 35; Mosch. *Epit. Bion.* 120; the other is the reference to *ἀνθέρικος* and *κόμαρος*. In view of the foregoing examination of Theocritus' influence upon Alciphron, it seems reasonable to suppose that if Alciphron's idea in ii. 9 is altogether traceable to the bucolic poetry, then he derived it directly from Theocritus, and not through Longus.

In fact, however, another influence is to be considered. The passage cited above from Alc. ii. 9 ends with the sentence, *ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσαις τὸν Ἡδωνὸν ἐμιμούμην τὸν παῖδα τῆς Καλλιόπης*. In

<sup>1</sup> But cf. Alexis *Incert.* 279K., where *βολβοί, κοχλῖαι, κήρυκες* are mentioned as *φάρμακα ἐρωτὶ ἐταίρας*.

<sup>2</sup> See, however, Meineke on i. 6. 2 and i. 34. 6, 8 (= i. 6. 2, iv. 7. 6, 8 Schepers). Stadtmüller on *Anth.* ix. 432 (Theocr. *Ep.* 6) finds reminiscences of this epigram in Alciphron iv. 10.

comparing the parallel passages in Alciphron and Longus, Reich does not quote this sentence, and seems to consider it of little or no importance. But it reveals the significant fact that in composing this letter Alciphron had in mind the legends of Orpheus and his charming of animals by the power of his music; and this reference explains at once the element in the letter which appears to be an enlargement upon the more familiar themes of pastoral poetry. Compare the Orphic passage in Apollonius cited above, also *Anth. Pal.* vii. 8, 9, and Philostr. Jun. *Imag.* 6. The same mingling of bucolic and Orphic elements occurs in Virg. *Buc.* viii. 3, where the Orphic coloring of the phrase *quorum stupefactae carmine lynces* did not escape the attention of Conington; see his note on the passage.

The presence of this Orphic feature in Alciphron's letter, together with our enhanced opinion of his knowledge of Theocritus, enables us to dismiss as unproved the contention that he must have derived the ideas here elaborated from Longus. On the other hand, the absence from the corresponding Longus passage of any direct indication of Orphic influence suggests that Longus may, after all, have imitated Alciphron here, as Rohde thought, only dropping the allusion to the Edonian bard. But it is doubtless safer to concede that the romancer could easily have developed the idea, which he uses here and elsewhere, from his close study of Theocritus.

2. We have next to deal with some passages of a very different character.

Longus iv. 16: ξιφίδιον λαβὼν καὶ ἐμπλήσας τὴν γαστέρα τροφῆς, ἐμμαντὸν ἀποκτενῶ πρὸ τῶν Δάφνιδος θυρῶν.

Alc. iii. 3. 3: ἔκρινα οὖν πολυτελοῦς τραπέζης ἀπολαύσας ἀποπτύσαι τὸ ζῆν, κρείττονα ὀδυνηροῦ βίου τὸν καθ' ἡδονὴν θάνατον ἡγησάμενος.

Alc. iii. 13. 3: οὐ πρότερον στραγγαλιῶ τὸν τράχηλον, πρὶν τραπέζης ἀπολαῦσαι πολυτελοῦς.

In each of these passages the speaker is a parasite who for some cause or other has become discontented and desperate. The resemblance in thought is so striking that one naturally supposes that one of the two authors must have imitated the other. It is not likely, however, that this notion of dying with a full stomach



is original with either Alciphron or Longus. It sounds like a "parasitism" pilfered from the Comedy, and such I believe to be the case. Note the following passages:

Plautus *Stich.* 638 ff.:

numquam edepol me vivom quisquam in crastinum inspiciet diem;  
nam mihi iam intus potione iunceae onerabo gulam,  
neque ego hoc committam ut me esse homines mortuom dicant fame.<sup>1</sup>

Gelasimus, the parasite, is the speaker. Somewhat akin to this passage is the description of a glutton's euthanasia in a fragment of Menander's Ἀλιεῖς, fr. 23 Kock:

\*Ἴδιον ἐπιθυμῶν μόνος μοι θάνατος οὖτος φαίνεται  
εὐθάνατος, ἔχοντα πολλὰς χολλάδας κείσθαι, πάχυν,  
ὑπτιον, μόλις λαλοῦντα, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμ' ἔχοντ' ἄνω,  
ἐσθίοντα καὶ λέγοντα· σήπομ' ὑπὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς.

It seems very likely that the idea exploited by Alciphron and Longus came into literary currency through the comedy of Menander that was the original of Plautus' *Stichus*.<sup>2</sup> That Alciphron took it directly from Menander is probable in view of his interest in that poet's work (cf. iv. 18 and 19, especially 19. 19 ff.), and the probability is heightened by another slight coincidence between a passage in the *Stichus* and one of the same letters of Alciphron in which the above-discussed sentiment occurs. Cf. *Stich.* 64: *non homines habitare mecum mihi videntur, set sues*, and Alc. iii. 13. 3: *ἄνευ ἡμῶν ἀνέορτα πάντα καὶ συνὼν οὐκ ἀνθρώπων πανήγυρις*.<sup>3</sup> It may also be remarked that the parallelism between *potione iunceae* in *Stich.* 639, cited above, and Ἀλιαρτίου σχοινίου, in Alc. iii. 13. 2, looks like something more than a coincidence.

The existence of a source whence both Alciphron and Longus could have derived the idea in question has thus been shown, and

<sup>1</sup>This passage was brought to my attention by the kindness of Mr. Eugene Tavenner, of the Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville. As this goes to press I find a modern illustration in an unexpected quarter. In Pinero's *Trelawney of the Wells*, p. 10, Tom Wrench pretends to stab himself with a pair of scissors which Mrs. Mossop has handed him. "Don't do that!" cries Mrs. Mossop. Tom answers, "You are right, sweet Mossop, I won't perish on an empty stomach."

<sup>2</sup>*Graeca Adelphoe Menandri* in the didascalia, but this is probably corrupt; see Schanz *Gesch. d. röm. Litt.*<sup>2</sup>, Part I, p. 55. Christ *Gesch. d. griech. Litt.*<sup>4</sup>, p. 323 assumes that Menander's Φιλάδελφοι was the original of the *Stichus*.

<sup>3</sup>This parallelism was observed by Volkmann *Studia Alciphronica*, p. 30.

it seems probable that the former drew upon this source directly. Is it equally probable that Longus drew directly upon Menander, or is it more likely that he imitated Alciphron in this particular? It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to decide this question. In his characterization of the base parasite Gnatho (iv. 10 ff.), Longus does exhibit points of contact with the Comedy, yet hardly enough of them to justify the conclusion that he studied it for himself. The chief literary influence at work in his romance is that of the bucolic poetry, as Reich has shown. In view of Alciphron's superior knowledge of the Comedy, which is generally conceded, one is tempted to return to the opinion of Rohde, namely, that Longus imitated Alciphron. But Reich's example is a warning against hasty decisions.

3. We reach a similar result in the following passages:

Long. iii. 15: τότε δ' ἐξ ἑωθινοῦ, σκηψαμένη πρὸς Χρῶμιν ὡς παρὰ τίκτουσαν ἀπεισι γείτονα, κτλ.

Ale. ii. 7: ὠδίνουσά με ἀρτίως ἦκειν ὡς αὐτὴν ἢ τοῦ γείτονος μετέπεμψε γύνῃ.

In Ar. *Eccl.* 528 f., Praxagora says in answer to her husband's inquiry why she had left home in the early morning

γυνή μέ τις νύκτωρ ἑταίρα καὶ φίλη  
μετεπέμψατ' ὠδίνουσα.<sup>1</sup>

Although Longus and Aristophanes have in common here the idea of giving the errand as an excuse, which Alciphron has not, still the resemblance between Alciphron's language and that of Aristophanes is so strong that we must reject Reich's contention that Alciphron is here indebted to Longus. Again there arises the doubt whether Longus did not rather imitate Alciphron, and the remark in the last paragraph applies here also.

4. Of especial interest is the similarity of two pretty descriptions of bird-catching in winter time, of which I quote as much as is necessary for purposes of comparison.

Longus iii. 3: γίγνεται δὲ χειμῶν . . . ἐξαίφνης γὰρ περιπεσοῦσα χιῶν πολλή πάσας μὲν ἀπέκλεισε τὰς ὁδοὺς, πάντας δὲ κατέκλεισε τοὺς γεωργοὺς. . . . ἢ γῇ πᾶσα ἀφανὴς ᾗν ὅτι μὴ περὶ πηγὰς πον καὶ ρεύματα. . . . iii. 5: πρὸ τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ Δριάντος, ὅπ' αὐτῇ τῇ αὐλῇ, μυρρίνας μεγάλας δύο καὶ κιττὸς ἐπεφύκει.

<sup>1</sup> Volkmann (*op. cit.*, p. 6) noted Alciphron's imitation of the passage from the *Ecclesiastusae*.

. . . ἦν οὖν πολὺ πλῆθος περὶ αὐτὸν τῶν χειμερινῶν ὀρνίθων, ἀπορία τῆς ἕξω τροφῆς· πολλὸς μὲν κόψιχος, πολλὴ δὲ κίχλη, καὶ φάτται καὶ ψᾶρες καὶ ὅσον ἄλλο κιττοφάγον πτερόν . . . iii. 6: καὶ (Δάφνης) . . . τοὺς τε βρόχους ἔστησε καὶ τὸν ἰξὸν ῥάβδοις μακραῖς ἐπήλειψε. . . ἄλλ' ὀρνίθες μὲν καὶ ἦγον πολλοὶ καὶ ἐλήφθησαν ἱκανοί, ὥστε πράγματα μύρια ἔσχε συλλέγων αὐτοὺς . . .

Alc. ii. 27: πολλὸς ὁ χειμῶν τὸ τῆτες καὶ οὐδενὶ ἐξιτητόν. πάντα γὰρ ἡ χιών κατεῖληφε, καὶ λευκανθίζουσιν οὐχ οἱ λόφοι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ κοῦλα τῆς γῆς . . . προκύβας δῆτα τῆς καλίβυς οὐκ ἔφθην παρανοίξας τὸ θύριον καὶ ὀρῶ σὺν τῷ νιφετῷ δῆμον ὅλον ὀρνέων φερόμενον, καὶ κοψίχους καὶ κίχλας. εὐθὺς οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς λεκάνης ἀνασπᾶσας ἰξὸν ἐπαλείφω τῶν ἀχράδων τοὺς κλάδους, καὶ ὅσον οὐπω τὸ νέφος ἐπέστη [τῶν στρουθίων] καὶ πᾶσαι ἐκ τῶν ὁροδάμνων ἐκρέμαντο, θέαμα ἡδύ, πτερῶν ἐχόμεναι καὶ κεφαλῆς καὶ ποδῶν εἰλημμένας.

The resemblance is considerably heightened by the omission in the citations from Longus of some paragraphs of the context, but even allowing for this it is not surprising that both Rohde and Reich thought that so striking a likeness must betray a plagiarism. However, a careful study of the context shows differences that are not without significance—for example, in Longus, Daphnis' fowling expedition is only a pretext for a visit to Chloe, and he prepares for it by taking with him the rods, snares, and bird-lime of the professional fowler. Alciphron's rustic seizes an unexpected opportunity, and hastily smears bird-lime on the branches of his pear trees. On the other hand, where these passages are alike, they are so only because they both deal with certain common-places of the fowler's art—a point which requires explanation at some length.

Three points of contact deserve consideration, the use of bird-lime, the mention of blackbirds and thrushes in both places, and the wintry setting of the description. Certainly no inference can be drawn from the fact that in both Alciphron and Longus bird-lime, the usual weapon of the fowler,<sup>1</sup> is the means employed to catch the birds. Again, blackbirds and thrushes are mentioned in both authors simply because they were among the commonest victims of the bird-hunter, and as such they are very frequently named together, just as an Italian fowler might couple ortolans and beccaficos, or as an American sportsman might speak of mallard and

<sup>1</sup>For a recent discussion of the universal use of the lime-rod in fowling, cf. B. O. Foster on Prop. ii. 19. 23 f. in *Class. Phil.* II, p. 213 ff.

teal in a breath. We find *κόψιχοι* (= *κόσσυφοι*) and *κίχλαι* coupled in Ar. *Ach.* 970; *Av.* 1080 f. and in several epigrams of the *Anthology* (ix. 76, 343, 373, 396). Finally, although the wintry landscape serves a literary purpose in Longus (see the context), which is scarcely, if at all, true in Alciphron, still we need not conclude that the latter imitated the former, or even that the occurrence of the common feature is fortuitous. For winter, and particularly the season of snow-storms, was considered the most favorable season for the use of some of the fowler's devices; cf. Paraph. Dionys. *De avibus* (Didot ed. of *Poetae bucol. et didact.*) i. 1, iii. 4. In the same work (iii. 13) *κόσσυφοι* and *κίχλαι* are said to be easily caught with a fall-trap in winter, probably because they linger about during that season, feeding upon the berries of the myrtle, laurel, and ivy (*ibid.* i. 27; cf. Longus iii. 5, cited above). A striking proof of the association of the fowler's craft with the winter season is to be found in Eumathius (Eustathius?) *De Hysmines et Hysminiae amoribus* iv. 18, where in the description of a series of pictures a fowler (*ἰξευτής*) symbolizes the late autumn and winter, just as a reaper and a vintager represent the seasons of their respective activities. The passage reads: *ὁ μετ' αὐτὸν ἰξευτῆς ὑπαινίττεται σοι τὸν χρόνον καθ' ὃν τὰ πτηνὰ τὸν χειμῶνα φρίσσει, καὶ μεταίρει πρὸς τὸ θερμότερον.*<sup>1</sup>

The two passages under examination, therefore, furnish no conclusive evidence that the resemblance is due to the imitation of one author by the other. Given literary forms which entail description of the pursuits of country people at all seasons,<sup>2</sup> it is not strange that the two writers should treat the subject of bird-catching in a similar manner. But if Alciphron needed for his letter any other source than his own knowledge of country life, I should be disposed to look for it, not in Longus, but in some such didactic poem as the *Ὀρυθιακά* of Dionysius, of the date of which, however, nothing definite seems to be known.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Ar. *Ach.* 877 with schol., Arist. *Meteor.*, p. 362a, 22.

<sup>2</sup> Alciphron, for example, treats of hare-hunting (ii. 1), of fox-trapping (ii. 19), of honey-gathering (ii. 20), of a sacrifice for rain (ii. 33), and of sheep-shearing (ii. 39).

<sup>3</sup> Croiset *Hist. de la litt. grecque* V, p. 619, places it tentatively in the second century A. D.

There are some points of resemblance between Alciphron's letter and certain passages in the prose paraphrase of the work of Dionysius. Compare the following:

Alc. ii. 27. 2: καὶ ὅσον οὕτω τὸ νέφος ἐπέστη [τῶν στρουθίων] καὶ πᾶσαι ἐκ τῶν οδοδάρμων ἐκρέμαντο, θέαμα ἡδύ, πτερῶν ἐχόμεναι καὶ κεφαλῆς καὶ ποδῶν εἰλημμένοι.

Paraph. Dionys. *De avibus* iii. 4: θαυμάτων δ' ἡδιστον στρουθοὺς ὁρᾶν ἰξῶ πεπεδημένους καὶ καταπίπτοντας. *Ibid.* i. 1: τερπνὴν δέ τις καὶ οὐκ ἄχαρις θέα ταχὺν ὄρνιν ἰδεῖν αἰρεθέντα βρόχου δεσμοῖς ἢ δένδρον μὲν τινος ἐφιζήσαντα κλάδῳ, καλάμῳ δέ, ὃν ἰξῶ τις ἐπαλείψας θηρατῆς ἀνατείνει, συγκολλώμενόν τε καὶ καθελκόμενον.

A similar idea, *mutatis mutandis*, is expressed in Oppian *Hal.* i. 71 f.:

πολλὴ γὰρ βλεφάροισι καὶ ἐν φρεσὶ τέριψι ἴδεσθαι  
παλλόμενον καὶ ἐλίσσόμενον πεπεδημένον ἰχθύν,

a circumstance which reminds us that Alciphron might have used the lost *Ἰξευτικά* of Oppian.<sup>1</sup>

5. An episode in Longus (iv. 7, 8) relates how a beautiful garden was laid waste by an enemy in the owner's absence. The old steward, fearing his master's wrath, exclaims: πῶς, πῶς δείξω νῦν τὸν παράδεισον τῷ δεσπότη; κρεμᾶ γέροντα ἄνθρωπον ἐκ τινος (μῖαs Hirschig) πίτυος ὡς Μαρσύαν· τάχα δὲ καὶ Δάφνιν. . . . And in Alc. ii. 18 a farmer's wife complained that a lazy hireling has let a she-goat be devoured by a wolf, and adds: πέπυσται δὲ τούτων οὐδὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ· εἰ δὲ μάθοι, κρεμήσεται μὲν ἐκ τῆς πλησίον πίτυος ὁ μισθωτός. Alciphron touches elsewhere upon the theme of worthless servants (ii. 21 and 36), but the coincidence regarding the pine tree is certainly an odd one in this case. It is to be observed that in both cases the threatened or apprehended punishment is not hanging in our special sense of the word, but rather being tied up to a pine for a sound flogging. In the first place it is not likely that a servant, especially a *μισθωτός* (as in the Alciphron passage), would be put to death for mere negligence; and in the second place, the context in Longus shows plainly that a flogging is meant. Cf. iv. 9: ἐθρήνει καὶ Χλόη Δάφνιν εἰ

<sup>1</sup> Croiset, however, suspects (*op. cit.* V, p. 622, n. 4) that some confusion with the similar poem of Dionysius may account for the ascription of an *Ἰξευτικά* to Oppian.

κρεμήσεται, καὶ ἤρχετο μηκέτ' ἐλθεῖν τὸν δεσπότην αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμέρας διήντλει μοχθηράς, ὥς ἤδη Δάφνιν βλέπουσα μαστιγούμενον. Besides, there is the allusion to the flaying of Marsyas in the passage already quoted. See also Hyperides, fr. 200 (Blass).

Reich (p. 53) makes much of the fact that Longus alludes very frequently to the pine in his idyllic descriptions, while Alciphron mentions it only twice (ii. 9. 1, 18. 3). This, however, is not quite fair, since Alciphron's *Epistulae rusticae* are almost the only part of his work that can properly be drawn into comparison with Longus, and they make only one of the four books of letters. Furthermore, the use of the pine as a kind of conventional background in rural descriptions has already been noticed, and it may adequately explain the choice of that particular kind of tree in Alc. ii. 18. 3, without reference to Longus' penchant for the pine. There is also much reason to regard the pine (πίτυς) as a tree of ill-luck and mourning, and hence a fit one for the chastisement of an evil-doer. So we may understand the legends of the ancient Πιτυοκάμπτης or Pine-bender, of the finding of Melicertes' dead body under a pine (Plut. *Quaest. conv.* v. 3. 1, p. 675E), and of the flaying of Marsyas, who was tied up to a pine tree (v. Roscher *Lex. der Mythol.* s. v. "Marsyas"). The epithet γοερά, which Nicander (*Alex.* 301) applies to the pine, alluding to the story of Marsyas, probably represents a widely prevailing superstition;<sup>1</sup> and the phrase ἐκ πίτυος κρέμασθαι may be a semi-proverbial expression for getting a flogging. Here, of course, we tread upon uncertain ground. Yet the evidence, such as it is, warns us against the conclusion that because the two passages contain a similar idea, either Alciphron or Longus must have borrowed from the other.

6. The rest of Reich's evidence may be dismissed with brief scrutiny. In the fact that the parasite Gnatho seeks to gain the favor of the offended Daphnis by helping him to find Chloe, who has been carried off by a herdsman (iv. 28 f.), Reich recognizes a significant parallel with Alc. iii. 5, where two parasites conspire to act as procurers for their patron by dragging a hetaira to his house. Certainly this is a very far-fetched comparison. He closes

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Preller-Robert, *Griech. Mythologie*, p. 594, n. 1; Rohde *Psyche*, p. 152, n. 1.

his case with some verbal evidence, which needs little comment, as follows:

μεσαιπόλιος, "grizzled," occurs in Long. iv. 13, Alc. ii. 22. 2, iii. 13. 2. Reich notes also, as the only other instances he has found, Homer *Il.* xiii. 361 and *Anth. Pal.* v. 233. Add Ael. *N. A.* xii. 43, where the word is one of several color-adjectives applied to horse-hair. This last example, involving as it does, a decidedly prosaic use of the word, allows us to conjecture that it had a wider circulation than the lexicons show among the sophists of the second and third centuries.<sup>1</sup> At any rate it lessens the slight importance which might else be attached to the occurrence of the word in Alciphron and Longus.

In Longus ii. 5, we find the phrase *καπυρὸν γελάσας*, in Alc. iii. 12. 4, *καπυρὸς ἐξεχύθη γέλως*. Reich reports the phrase *καπυρὸν γελᾶν* only once elsewhere, *Anth. Pal.* vii. 414 (Nossis). But note *καπυρὸν στόμα*, Theocr. vii. 37, Mosch. iii. 94 (Ahrens). Attention has already been called to Alciphron's use of Theocr. vii. Luc. *Deorum dial.* xxii. 3 has *καπυρὸν συρίζειν*, Ath. xv. 697B *καπυρώτεραι ᾠδαί*.

Long. iv. 20: *τὴν ὀφρὺν εἰς αὐτὸν τοξοποιήσας*; Alc. ii. 16. 2: *τοξοποιεῖ τὰς ὀφρῦς*. Reich cites also Ar. *Lys.* 8: *τοξοποιεῖν τὰς ὀφρῦς*, which seems to be the only other place where the phrase occurs. But if, as seems likely, either Alciphron or Longus borrowed from Aristophanes, we should not hesitate, in view of Alciphron's well-known use of Aristophanes, to assign the priority in adapting the phrase to him rather than to Longus.

Reich's comparison, *κιττοφάγος* (Long. iii. 5), *κιττοστεφής* (Alc. iii. 12. 1) deserves mention only as an example of his determined, not to say desperate, attempts to make something of every faint resemblance between the two authors.

Such is the evidence upon which we are invited to place the little-known Longus in the second century A. D. and to regard him as one of Alciphron's models. Upon such evidence we find critics of the importance of Christ and Norden accepting the conclusions of Reich. One would like to know to what extent their favorable reception of his views is due to a subjective feeling—which Nor-

<sup>1</sup>Cf. also Pollux ii. 12.

den acknowledges—that Longus' superiority in style to the rest of the romancers entitles him to an earlier chronological position than that usually accorded him. In my judgment the evidence which Reich has used is quite insufficient to prove that Alciphron was in any way dependent upon Longus; and in more than one place where the two authors have a common point of contact with comic ideas or comic words,<sup>1</sup> Alciphron's generally conceded exploitation of the Comedy would rather influence one to the belief that he drew directly from the comic poets, while Longus took the comic matter from Alciphron at second hand—thus returning to the view of Rohde. But any sweeping declaration to that effect would be peculiarly out of place in an article which has several times already passed unfavorable criticisms upon the over-certain tone of Reich's dissertation. Perhaps, after all, we are dealing only with an independent use of the same sources.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

<sup>1</sup>See paragraphs 2 and 3 of this section of the paper, and also paragraph 6 on the phrase, *τοξοποιεῖν τὰς δόρυς*.